



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/815,102	03/30/2004	Andrew A. Conway	208.1005.01	6571
22883	7590	08/23/2007	EXAMINER	
SWERNOFSKY LAW GROUP PC			RIGGS II, LARRY D	
P.O. BOX 390013			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94039-0013			1631	
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/23/2007		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/815,102	CONWAY, ANDREW A.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Larry D. Riggs II	1631	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2007.  
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8, 11-18 and 21-23 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-8, 11-18 and 21-23 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

The examiner of the instant application has been changed to Larry D. Riggs II, Art Unit 1631.

### ***Sequence Rules Compliance***

This application contains sequence disclosures that are encompassed by the definitions for nucleotide and/or amino acid sequences set forth in 37 CFR 1.821(a)(1) and (a)(2). Such sequence is present on page 7 of the specification. Applicants are reminded that it is required that SEQ ID NOS be amended into the specification at each sequence. Failure to comply with these requirements may result in ABANDONMENT of the application under 37 CFR 1.821(g).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8, 11-18 and 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 in lines 2, 4 and 6-8; claim 11 in line 3 and claim 21 in line 6, recite the limitation "inbred population". It is unclear what defines an inbred population from the definition in the specification and claims. The specification equates being Amish as to being inbred, however, this would not allow one skilled in the art to determine if whether

other populations confined by possible religious, geographic, political or social statuses should be included in this indefinite term.

Claim 1 in lines 2, 4 and 6-8; claim 2 in lines 2 and 3; claim 3 in line 3; claim 11 in line 3; claim 12 in lines 2 and 3; claim 13 in lines 2 and 3 and claim 21 in line 6 recites the limitation "inbred". It is unclear what defines inbred from the definition in the specification and claims. Does an individual have to be homozygous for a certain number of genes? Do they have to be born from an incestual relationship? Do they have to originate from a small community or an island nation in the Caribbean?

Claim 1 in lines 8, 9 and 15; claim 11 in lines 1,4 and 10 and claim 21 in lines 7 and 13 recites the phrase "estimated genotype". The specification nor claims gives a definition of this term. It is unclear which gene, genes or if the entire genome would be within the estimated genotype.

Claim 1 in line 14; claim 11 in line 9 and claim 21 in line 12 recites the limitation "scores under various assumptions". It is unclear what those various assumptions are to enable one skilled in the art to determine the scores.

Claim 1 in lines 19 and 21; claim 11 in lines 14 and 16 and claim 21 in lines 17 and 19 recites the limitation "the founder". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 1 in lines 11 and 12; claim 11 in lines 7 and 8 and claim 21 in lines 10 and 11 recites the limitation "exhibiting particular homozygous pairs of alleles more frequently than would occur randomly". It is unclear to one skilled in the art how it is known what would be random homozygosity for any chosen population.

Claim 2 in line 2; claim 3 in line 3; claim 12 recites in line 2 and claim 13 in line 2 recites the limitation "relatively inbred population". It is unclear what defines an inbred population from the definition in the specification and claims. The specification equates being Amish as to being inbred, however, this would not allow one skilled in the art to determine if whether other populations confined by possible religious, geographic, political or social statuses should be included in this indefinite term. How is one skilled in the art to determine the difference between a legitimate inbred population and a relatively inbred population before carrying out this invention?

### ***Double Patenting***

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Regarding use of the specification in obviousness-type double patenting rejections, the MPEP states in section 804:

When considering whether the invention defined in a claim of an application is an obvious variation of the invention defined in the claim of a patent, the disclosure of the patent may not be used as prior art. This does not mean that one is precluded from all use of the patent disclosure.

The specification can always be used as a dictionary to learn the meaning of a term in the patent claim. *In re Boylan*, 392 F.2d 1017, 157 USPQ 370 (CCPA 1968). Further, those portions of the specification which provide support for the patent claims may also be examined and considered when addressing the issue of whether a claim in the application defines an obvious variation of an invention claimed in the patent. *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 441-42, 164 USPQ 619, 622 (CCPA 1970). The court in *Vogel* recognized "that it is most difficult, if not meaningless, to try to say what is or is not an obvious variation of a claim," but that one can judge whether or not the invention claimed in an application is an obvious variation of an embodiment disclosed in the patent which provides support for the patent claim. According to the court, one must first "determine how much of the patent disclosure pertains to the invention claimed in the patent" because only "[t]his portion of the specification supports the patent claims and may be considered." The court pointed out that "this use of the disclosure is not in contravention of the cases forbidding its use as prior art, nor is it applying the patent as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 103, since only the disclosure of the invention claimed in the patent may be examined."

Claims 1, 11 and 21 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 11 and 21 of copending Application No. 11/581132. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1, 11 and 21 of application 11/581132 are a genus of the species claims 1, 11 and 21 in the instant application. The specification of application 11/581132 provides for the species, (see page 17, lines 1-3; page 17, line 18 – page 19, line 3; page 19, line 17 – page 21, line 6).

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Larry D. Riggs II whose telephone number is 571-270-3062. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:30AM-5:00PM, ALT. Friday, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ram Shukla can be reached on 571-272-0735. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/LDR/  
Larry D. Riggs II  
Examiner, Art Unit 1631

/John S. Brusca/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1631